

REMARKS

In the above-identified Office Action, Claim 7 was objected to as a result of an omission of several words. The omission has been remedied in the foregoing amendment.

In addition, all of the claims were rejected as being anticipated by the cited Curtin patent. However, independent Claims 1, 7 and 13 have now been amended and are believed to be patentable over the Curtin patent for the reasons given below.

An aspect of the present invention, as set out in Claim 1, provides a method of forming object groups from received objects. For each received object the method performs a number of steps. The method starts by passing data describing the present received object to a number of detection schemes. Each detection scheme has an associated object group type, and is operative to detect whether the present received object forms part of an object group of the schemes associated object group type. Each detection scheme also has a priority.

In response to passing the data to the detection schemes, the method then receives notification from at least one of the detection schemes as to whether that received object forms part of the object group of the object group type associated with that detection scheme. Also, notification is received from at least one of the detection schemes as to whether the object group of the associated object group type is completely formed upon inclusion of the present received object in that object group. Partly formed object groups form a list, and a completely formed object group is output for rendering based on the priorities.

The cited Curtin patent, on the other hand, relates to a method and apparatus for entering data in a computer using an abbreviated keyboard wherein each key of the keyboard represents a plurality of characters. The computer, upon receipt of a signal resulting from a

depression of a key, generates a best guess of which one of the plurality of characters associated with the depressed key is desired by the user to be ultimately entered into the computer. A display indicates the guess. The user may accept the guess, if correct, or press further keys until the correct character is displayed.

In the Office Action, the Examiner equates the algorithm disclosed in the Curtin patent which determines a ranked list of guesses as to which character was meant by the key press, with the detection scheme defined in the independent claims of the present application. It is respectfully submitted that this is inappropriate, because the detection scheme defined in application independent claims returns a Boolean notification, as to whether the received object forms part of the object group of the object group type associated with the detection scheme. The algorithm disclosed in Curtin, in contrast, merely provides a ranked list of guesses.

Also, as acknowledged in the Office Action, the Curtin patent discloses only a single "detection scheme", whereas the amended independent claims require the data to be passed to a plurality of detection schemes.

It is asserted also in the Office Action that the display of "the four alphanumeric characters of a group" is inherently equivalent to detection of whether a received object forms part of an object group. However, this assertion is inconsistent with that on page 2 of the Office Action where the claimed "object groups" are equated with "character strings" in Curtin. Secondly, the fact that Curtin discloses the display of four alternative characters for a key press does not indicate that any detection has taken place. The four alternatives could be displayed in any order.

The Examiner further equates the user's first press of the control key 19 with both the claimed "receiving a notification ... whether that received object forms part of the object group(s)", and "determining whether one or more of the object groups are completely formed...". The foregoing is contradicted in the Response to Arguments wherein it is asserted that the user's second control key press may be identified with the latter action. This also contradicts the assertion made on page 2 of the Office Action that the detection is "inherent".

The asserted "notification ... of whether that received object forms part of the object group(s)" is received from the user in Curtin, and not from the detection schemes as defined in Applicant's claims.

In view of the foregoing, it is submitted that all of the pending claims, including the dependent claims, are allowable over the Curtin patent, wherefore the issuance of a Notice of Allowance is solicited.

Applicant's undersigned attorney may be reached in our New York Office by telephone at (212) 218-2100. All correspondence should continue to be directed to our address listed below.

Respectfully submitted,

/John A. Krause/
John A. Krause
Attorney for Applicant
Registration No. 24,613

FITZPATRICK, CELLA, HARPER & SCINTO

30 Rockefeller Plaza
New York, New York 10112-3801
Facsimile: (212) 218-2200

NY_MAIN 597383v1